1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON DIVISION		
2			
3		CR. NO. H-16-408-7 HOUSTON, TEXAS	
4	VS	FEBRUARY 3, 2020	
5	CHARLES EARL GROB, JR 1	L0:25 A.M. to 10:56 A.M.	
6	_		
7	TRANSCRIPT of S BEFORE THE HONORABLE VA	ANESSA D. GILMORE	
8	UNITED STATES DIS	TRICT JUDGE	
9			
10	<u>APPEARANCES</u> :		
11 12	ll t	MR. JUSTIN R. MARTIN J.S. Attorneys Office 1000 Louisiana Street	
13	S	Suite 2300 Houston, Texas 77002	
14			
15		MR. JAMES MADISON ARDOIN, III Jimmy Ardoin & Associates,	
16		PLLC	
17		1900 Fournace Place, 550 Houston, Texas 77401	
18			
19		MS. KATHY L. METZGER J.S. Courthouse	
20	5	515 Rusk Room 8004	
21	H	Houston, Texas 77002 713-250-5208	
22		713 230 3200	
23			
24	Proceedings recorded by mechanical	stenography transcript	
25	produced by computer-aided transcri	iption.	

PROCEEDINGS 1 2 THE COURT: United of America versus Charles Grob. For the United States? 3 MR. MARTIN: Justin Martin for the United States. 4 5 THE COURT: And then for the defendant then, please? 10:25:19 MR. ARDOIN: Good morning, Your Honor. Jimmy Ardoin 6 on behalf of Mr. Grob, who's present in the courtroom. 7 8 THE COURT: All right. THE DEFENDANT: Good morning, Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Good morning. We're here this morning for 10 10:25:29 a sentencing. Mr. Martin, did you see the presentence 11 12 investigation report and the addendum to that report? MR. MARTIN: Yes, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: And, Mr. Ardoin, have you and your client 14 10:25:48 15 had a chance to review the presentence investigation report as well as the addendum? 16 17 MR. ARDOIN: Yes, Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Then the presentence investigation report 19 and the addendum will be placed into the record under seal. the event that there's any appeal of this case, the only 20 10:25:57 portion that will not be disclosed will be that portion that 21 contains a sentencing recommendation from the probation 22 23 department to the Court. 24 There were no objections by the United States or 25 by the defense. Mr. Ardoin, did you find any mistakes or 10:26:07

anything that could have an impact on sentencing? 1 10:26:10 2 MR. ARDOIN: No, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: All right. Then the Court adopts the presentence investigation report and the addendum, finds that 4 5 the statutory range of punishment is not more than five years. 10:26:17 Supervised release, not more than three years. Fine, not more 6 than 250,000. Restitution undetermined at this date. Special 7 8 assessment is \$100. Under the Sentencing Guidelines, based on a total 9 offense level of 33 and a criminal history category of I, 10:26:32 10 provides for a quideline range of 135 to 168, which becomes 60 11 months under 5G of the Sentencing Guidelines. Supervised 12 release term of one to three years. Fine range, 17,500 to 13 175,000. Restitution undetermined at this time. Special 14 10:26:57 15 assessment is \$100. All right. Mr. Ardoin, what would you like to 16 17 say on behalf of your client, please? 18 MR. ARDOIN: Yes, Your Honor. I filed a sentencing memorandum, which I'm sure the Court is aware of. 19 THE COURT: Yes, I think I got it. Yes. 20 10:27:09 21 MR. ARDOIN: And I know it's a very aggressive request in this case given the loss amount and everything, but I am 22 23 requesting probation. 24 THE COURT: Yeah, I didn't get that. MR. ARDOIN: I know, Your Honor. 10:27:18

THE COURT: I read it, and I was like why. How is 10:27:19 1 this a probation case? 2 MR. ARDOIN: I understand, Your Honor. And I know 3 4 it's a --5 THE COURT: I mean, the quideline range is 135 to 168. 10:27:25 6 He's already getting a gift. 7 MR. ARDOIN: I know. I think you and I have been down that road in cases before. 8 9 THE COURT: Yeah. MR. ARDOIN: So I understand the Court's perspective 10 10:27:33 on that. But I would direct the Court to the attachment to the 11 PSR, which was this sale of stock --12 THE COURT: Right. 13 MR. ARDOIN: -- chart. It's 50 million dollars' worth 14 10:27:45 15 of sale of stock. Mr. Grob is not on it. Not a single line of this applies to Mr. Grob. He never sold any stock. He didn't 16 17 profit out of the stock sales. THE COURT: So, but you're saying that -- are you 18 trying to say he didn't profit at all? 19 MR. ARDOIN: No, I'm not saying that. I'm not saying 20 10:28:01 he didn't profit at all. He was paid his salary. He gained a 21 total of \$242,000 --22 23 THE COURT: Right. 24 MR. ARDOIN: -- as part of this. And, you know, he 25 was brought into this by a close friend of his who was 10:28:10

10:28:15

10:28:28

10:28:44

10:29:06

10:29:27

10:29:42

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

associated with the group who was never charged. Initially he 1 believed this to be a legitimate venture, but it turned out it 2 3 was not and he realized it was not, but he stuck with it. there's no justification. And he'll tell you there's no good 4 5 excuse for why he stayed in. Whether he felt trapped or I know the PSR recognizes he's had a lot of mental health issues and 6 substance abuse issues, whether those contributed to why he 7 8 stayed and needing the paycheck and the money, I'll let him address that. 9

But the reality is if you look at the factual allegations of what was laid out, he just did what everybody told him to do. There was no independent thought on his part in terms of the press releases, in terms of the phone calls. He was basically given a script by Mr. Farmer and Mr. Massey. Those were the two. In fact, there were -- and I don't think it made it into the PSR, but there were several statements by Mr. Massey where he even describes that, you know, Mr. Grob was not -- he should have never even been the CEO. That he was -- you know, he just did what we told him to do, that that was all he was good for. That Mr. Massey, in fact, felt that he should be the CEO running the organization and doing everything, because that's what he was essentially doing.

Now, Mr. Massey, of course, pled first. He was the first one to come in. He did the deal pre-indictment.

Mr. Grob was the second one to plead. He was part of the

10:29:45 10:29:58 10 10:30:13 11 12 13

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10:30:48

20

10:31:07

second wave that came in. And he was the first one of the second group, the larger group to cut a deal, and he was ready to come in and testify against everyone else.

So I think in terms of his role, he's clearly less culpable than the others. Far less culpable than the others in terms of what he actually profited from them and what he -- he was essentially, even though he knew what he was doing, he was really a puppet at the end of the day, doing what --

THE COURT: You're saying his culpability is less because he got less money?

MR. ARDOIN: Well, I think that that's part of it. think that part of it is he was also -- he was more of a, like I said, just more of a -- someone who was directed on what to He knowingly did it. There's no doubt about that. he'll tell you that. He knowingly did the sham investor agreements. He went out and they got him -- you know, they asked him to go get his friends and family to do it, and that's what he did. There's no doubt about that. And he got a lot of people involved in this case and ruined a lot of friendships because of it, with the SEC case and everything else.

I think that even though he had the title of CEO, that's really not what he was. Farmer and Massey were effectively the CEOs running everything behind the scenes. The CEO title in his case is nothing more than them putting

somebody else out there to be -- you know, to kind of fly under 1 10:31:13 the radar undetected, if you will, until people started to 2 3 realize what was going on. And as the facts would bear out, when FINRA 4 called, when everybody else called -- was making the calls to 5 10:31:23 Mr. Grob, he won't talk to them without first going to Massey 6 7 and Farmer and say, What do I say here? What's going on? That's, you know, that's when everything starts to really 8 unravel in terms of the whole scheme, if you will, is that he starts getting calls from news outlets. And he won't -- he 10 10:31:41 won't say anything to people without Massey or Farmer right 11 there by his side to answer those phone calls. 12 And so, yes, he had a role. There's no doubt 13 But he was not, even though his title was CEO, he 14 about it. 10:31:58 15 was not the main person in this thing. I think the sale of stock bears that out. 50 million -- 50 million sales of 16 17 stock -- 50 million dollars' worth of sale of stock, he's not 18 on one single line of this. And so that's just part of it, but I think the other is --19 In terms of you mean having made money out 20 THE COURT: 10:32:14 of it? 21 22 MR. ARDOIN: Correct. 23 THE COURT: But how many lines is he on it in terms of

which of these -- which companies he got investors to come in

24

25

10:32:28

and invest?

MR. ARDOIN: So Chimera, which is the only one on this 1 10:32:29 list that he was involved with. So it's 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 2 3 8, 9, 10, 11, 11 lines on here. And they're all Eddie Austin, Scott Sieck, some other entities on behalf of those people or 4 5 on behalf of Andrew Farmer. He wasn't associated with the 10:33:06 stock sales. He was certainly associated with the pump and 6 signing the press releases, talking to the media, getting the 7 straw investors to help them even get to the IPO. The straw 8 investors were all these people --9 THE COURT: What he did was an integral part of this 10 10:33:25 whole scheme. Without his participation, the scheme wouldn't 11 have worked. I mean, what he did in terms of --12 MR. ARDOIN: I agree with that, Your Honor, but I 13 think based upon the fact that essentially Farmer and Massey 14 10:33:40 15 were pulling the strings, it could have been anybody. so happened to be him. It just so happened to be Mr. Grob. 16 17 THE COURT: Which is why he's standing here. 18 MR. ARDOIN: Correct. But what I'm saying is, that he was not an integral part. They could have pulled this scheme 19 20 off with anybody else. It wasn't --10:33:55 21 THE COURT: I know, but I mean in terms of his involvement, I'm just talking about what he did. 22 23 MR. ARDOIN: Right. 24 THE COURT: He was an integral part of this whole If he hadn't done what he did, it wouldn't have 25 10:34:03

worked. I mean, I'm only talking about what his role was --1 10:34:07 2 3 4 5 don it. Anybody could have done it. 10:34:15 6 MR. ARDOIN: Absolutely, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: But you didn't. 8 MR. ARDOIN: Right. THE COURT: He's the one who did it. 9 MR. ARDOIN: 10 10:34:20 11 12 13 overall role of the company. 14 10:34:33 15 16 17 18 19 20 10:34:55 21 22 23 case. 24 gone out and he's gotten -- he's been in treatment for alcohol. 25 10:35:10

MR. ARDOIN: Completely agree, Your Honor. THE COURT: -- in this particular case, not the fact that anybody could have done this. You know, you could have That's right. And I'm not trying to --I'm not trying to lessen his role. I'm trying to distinguish him from where the others are in this whole -- in this whole thing. And so I think that's where he stands in terms of the Now, in terms of what he's done since this, which I think also helps bear upon my request, is that he settled the case with the SEC. He's paid back almost half of what he agreed to pay the SEC back at this point. He's working with the receiver to identify more assets to help satisfy that judgment, which we're hopeful that that should be satisfied There's a sale of a home, which should hopefully satisfy that and also be used to go to further restitution in this I think the other things that he's done is he's

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

10:36:23

10:36:44

He's been to AA. He's been in mental health treatment. He's been in both of those. And, also, he's set up a new company where he's actually making a legitimate living for himself and employing other people, as a general contractor. And I know I included letters from some of his customers, who know him to be nothing but an honest and ethical businessman when dealing with him.

And so I think in terms of what he's done since this -- I mean, this -- he left in 2014, and the SEC case was filed not long after that. So he knew this day was coming, I mean, he knew that this was going to be the end Your Honor. result. Now six years later did he know that that -- that it was going to be coming? I probably think that he anticipated it was going to be a lot sooner than six years from the SEC falling in on everybody. But in that six years time, he's done everything that I think you could ask of somebody to do to turn his life around and make the turn away from being a part of illegal conduct and being a part of groups like this. gone out and he's set up a thriving new business, helping people during -- after Hurricane Harvey. I mean, I think that he has -- he has really shown what we want of everybody who goes through this system, and that is, to turn their life around.

And I know it's a big request to go from what would be an over ten-year sentence down to probation, that he

pled to the original count, I realize that. But I think that 1 10:36:49 there are characteristics of him that warrant consideration for 2 it. 3 THE COURT: Mr. Grob, what would you like say on your 4 5 own behalf, sir? 10:37:10 6 THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I'm truly sorry for all of the pain that my actions have caused. The pain that it has 7 8 caused those who lost money because of my actions. that it has caused my family, including my mother and my uncle, who are here today. And to those who were once my friends, who 10 10:37:24 11 I involved in this scheme and I'm sorry that I dragged their names through this mess. Like Jimmy said, I got --12 THE COURT: Did you recruit friends and family to be 13 investors in this, too? 14 10:37:43 15 THE DEFENDANT: It was a different -- it was considered -- it's not selling stock on the open market. 16 17 very small amounts, maybe a couple hundred dollars here and 18 there is what it was. At this point in time, I thought this was a legitimate investment. 19 20 THE COURT: So is that a "yes"? 10:37:57 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 22 THE COURT: Okay. Okay. 23 MR. ARDOIN: And if I may pause there, Your Honor, 24 this was -- they needed these investors to be able to take it to an initial public offering. And he didn't understand how 10:38:06

this all worked until he later looked at it and saw that what 1 10:38:11 he had done was -- with regard to that was incorrect and -- but 2 3 he still continued to sign these press releases and everything else. So that's how this whole thing came about, was they 4 needed a certain number of investors in order to take the 10:38:26 5 company public. And so he recruited --6 7 THE DEFENDANT: Right. 8 MR. ARDOIN: -- friends and family to become those. And that's what they refer to as the straw investors, Your 9 Honor. 10:38:36 10 11 THE DEFENDANT: And none of those investors lost money or anything like that in that particular stage of the 12 investment process. 13 14 THE COURT: I'm sorry. Speak up. 10:38:43 15 THE DEFENDANT: None of those friends and family -none of those S-1 and early investors were harmed financially. 16 17 THE COURT: Oh, okay. THE DEFENDANT: Like Jimmy said, I got in this ordeal 18 19 by trusting one of my closest friends going back to Boy Scouts, since we were knee high. I did not come into it with the 20 10:38:58 intention of committing a fraud. Somewhere along the way, I 21 should mention, things kind of became apparent, not overnight, 22 through a series of events, that this was not a legitimate 23 endeavor. And this is when I kind of freaked out and felt 24 stuck. I was the CEO of this company. I didn't know what else 25 10:39:19

10:40:48

to do. I was assured by the others that everything was legitimate. And then, you know, I didn't -- I stayed there, and that's the biggest mistake I made. I own that. I should have cut and run for the hills and not listen to what I wanted to believe. I should have seen the light and run the other way and --

THE COURT: Why didn't you?

THE DEFENDANT: I don't have a good excuse, other than the fact that I was trapped -- I felt trapped. I didn't know what to do. I should have. That's a mistake of mine. I own that. I'm here to own that mistake. That was, like I said, probably the worst decision of my life.

And I've known this day has been coming six, sevens years, since the SEC came in. During this time I've dealt with many hardships, including the death of my father and my grandfather. I'm divorced because of this. My reputation and many of my personal relationships are just destroyed.

I understand asking for probation is a big request in light of these allegations and I know it's not something that is handed out often in federal court. But I want the Court to know that I have been doing everything in my power to better my life and do what I set out to do after I graduated the business school of fraud, joined this group, which is running a successful start-up company. Over the past five years, I've done just that. Now I have clients and

10:42:27

workers that do depend on me on a daily basis. I'm afraid that incarceration will destroy all the efforts that I put forth. While I'm hoping for probation, no matter what, I have turned my life around and I will never involve myself in any kind of conduct or associate with any types of people of this nature again, I promise you that.

THE COURT: Mr. Martin, anything from the United States?

MR. MARTIN: I agree with the defense that some of these enhancements may not be capturing the true culpability of the defendant.

THE COURT: Like what?

MR. MARTIN: The officer, director enhancement. I think that, as a plus four enhancement, I think that is sort of meant in a situation where the defendant is taking a leadership type of role in the company. Whereas in this situation this defendant was clearly not in a leadership position. He was following instructions of the other defendants.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MARTIN: The prior order enhancement, he had left the conspiracy -- that's capturing the fact that it was -- that if the crime was in violation of some prior judicial order, you get the two-level enhancement. The only -- the Chimera SEC injunction came after he left the conspiracy. The injunction for Chimera was entered in 2015, but this defendant left in

2014. There were two prior injunctions for Solar America. 1 Ι 10:42:32 did not see any evidence in this case that he was aware of 2 3 those injunctions against Eddie Austin and Carolyn Austin. may have been, but I don't have any evidence of it. So I'll 4 5 just --10:42:49 THE COURT: Are you talking about the offense 6 7 characteristic in Paragraph 82? 8 MR. MARTIN: Yes. 9 THE COURT: Okay. So his conduct did come after an SEC MR. MARTIN: 10 10:42:57 injunction against Eddie Austin and Carolyn Austin for Solar 11 America. 12 THE COURT: Uh-huh. 13 MR. MARTIN: I just didn't see any evidence that he 14 10:43:11 15 was aware of that, because he wasn't in the inner circle of the defendants. He wasn't a partner in the organization. And I've 16 seen -- and what I was going to discuss was that one of the 17 things I noticed when I was prosecuting this case is that this 18 defendant is, my position and the position of the United 19 States, is certainly the least culpable defendant of all the 20 10:43:30 defendants that were charged in this case. 21 22 THE COURT: So he made the least money too, I guess, huh? 23 24 MR. MARTIN: Yes. It guess that kind of goes hand in hand, 10:43:41

huh?

MR. MARTIN: Yeah, he was -- he was just given a flat salary. He was not a decision-maker. He was following the instructions of the other defendants. And, again, not in the inner circle, so he was definitely kept in the dark on some aspects of the fraud, particularly the foreign aspects. I see no evidence that he was aware of all the foreign accounts and the foreign nominees that the defendants were using.

In light of those factors and in my view that some of the enhancements may not be as applicable, I don't think it's as much of a departure as it would be otherwise. My recommendation is a sentence below 60 months, and I would recommend 36 months.

(Judge conferring with the probation officer at the bench, off the record.)

THE COURT: All right. The Court will state the sentence at this time. The lawyers will have a final opportunity to make any objections before the sentence is imposed.

It is the judgment of this Court that the defendant, Charles Grob, is hereby committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for 12 months and 1 day.

The defendant stands before this Court having entered a plea of guilty to conspiracy to commit wire fraud. His involvement lasted from 2011 through 2014. The criminal

10:48:42

scheme perpetrated by the defendant and his accomplices centered on securities fraud and defrauded -- that defrauded investors of their money by fraudulently manipulating the market price and demand for various microcap securities commonly referred to as penny stocks, which after being artificially inflated were dumped for financial gain.

Although the defendant and his accomplices profited, the security investors lost millions. The defendant was listed as the CEO of Chimera Energy in 2011, and his role was to follow the instructions that were given to him by the group's partners, which included approving press releases and spreading company -- spending company money on expenses approved by the group and issuing stock to investors as directed by the group and signing contracts and agreements when instructed by the group. And while he was involved in preparing false press releases, his accomplices funded a false advertising campaign to fraudulently inflate the price of securities. He also assisted in recruiting straw investors in furtherance of this scheme.

However, the Court would note that the defendant's role in this scheme was much more limited than his accomplices and, in fact, that he was directed by his accomplices with respect to all of his activity and additionally, that while all the other accomplices were directly profiting from the sale of the stock, that during the

entire time that this scheme was taking place, that the -- that 1 10:48:46 this defendant received a very modest salary for the work that 2 he was doing, which is in contrast to the multiple millions of 3 dollars that were made by all of the other defendants. 4 defendant was paid a salary that fluctuated from 2500 to \$5,000 10:49:10 5 However, during the period of time that this 6 defendant and his accomplices were involved, they defrauded 7 8 investors of \$15,604,637.20. Grob was paid a total of \$242,000 as compensation for his role in this conspiracy. 9 He faced a much larger guideline range having 10 10:49:37 been convicted of all of the counts; however, he was permitted 11 to plead to one count with a maximum custody period of no more 12 than five years. 13

> The Court does not believe that a sentence of probation is sufficient, but believes that a sentence of 12 months and 1 day will impress upon this defendant the seriousness of his conduct, the harm he caused to society, and also provide just punishment for his actions, provide deterrence, and promote respect for the law. This sentence is considered sufficient and necessary but not greater than necessary to comply with the purposes and provisions of 18 U.S.C. Section 3553(a).

Upon release from imprisonment, the defendant shall be placed on supervised release for a term of three years. A term of supervised release is mandated in this case

14

10:50:01

16

17

18

15

19

20 10:50:22

21

22 23

24

10:50:39

10:50:43

given the expected restitution payment to be due in this case.

2

1

4

5

6

7

8

Within 72 hours of release from the custody of the Bureau of Prisons, the defendant shall report in person to

the probation office in the district to which the defendant is

released.

able to do so.

While on supervised release the defendant must participate in an inpatient or outpatient alcohol abuse treatment program and follow all of the rules of the treatment program. The probation officer will supervise the duration, modality, provider, and location of the program as well as its intensity. You must pay the cost of the program if financially

You must not use or possess alcohol.

You must pay the financial penalty imposed in accordance with the schedule that will be entered in this case.

You must submit to substance abuse testing to determine if you've used a prohibitive substance. And you must pay the cost of testing if financially able to do so.

You must participate in a mental health treatment program and follow the rules and regulations of that program.

The probation officer in consultation with the treatment provider will supervise your participation in the program, including the provider location, modality, duration, and intensity. You must pay the cost of the program if financially able to do so.

10:50:57

10:51:14

12

10

11

14

13

10:51:35 15

16

17 18

19

10:51:50 20

22

21

24

23

10:52:04 25

You must take all mental health medications that 1 10:52:05 are prescribed by your treating physician. You must pay the 2 cost of the medication if financially able to do so. 3 You must provide the probation officer with 4 5 access to any requested financial information and authorize the 10:52:16 release of any financial information. The probation office 6 will share that information with the U.S. Attorneys Office. 7 8 You are prohibited from possessing any credit access devices, like a credit card, unless you are authorized 9 by the probation officer. 10:52:32 10 You must not engage in any occupation, business, 11 profession, or volunteer activity that would require and enable 12 you to have fiduciary responsibility without the prior approval 13 of the probation officer. 14 10:52:43 15 You're further ordered to pay to the United 16 States a special assessment of \$100 due and payable immediately. 17 The Court finds that the defendant does not have 18 the ability to pay a fine in addition to the restitution. 19 Court reserves the right to make a final determination on 20 10:52:53 restitution and amend the judgment to include the restitution 21 amount as soon as it is reasonably able to do so. 22 23 The defendant shall make a lump sum payment of 24 \$100 due and payable immediately. The balance due will be payable at the rate of \$25 per quarter or 50 percent of any 10:53:11

```
wages while in prison in accordance with the Bureau of Prisons
          1
10:53:15
             Inmate Financial Responsibility Program. Any balance remaining
          2
             after release from imprisonment shall be paid in equal monthly
          3
             installments of no less than $100 per month to commence 60 days
          4
             after the date of release to a term of supervision. Payment is
10:53:29
          5
             to be made through the United States District Clerk's Office,
          6
             Southern District of Texas.
          7
          8
                           Mr. Martin, do you know of any reason why the
             sentence should not be imposed as stated?
          9
                      MR. MARTIN: Only requesting that the Court also make
         10
10:53:41
         11
             the money judgment part of the sentence and include it in the
             judgment.
         12
                                         The money judgment. And then what
         13
                      THE COURT: Okay.
             did I -- I don't remember how much it was.
         14
10:53:51
         15
                      MR. MARTIN:
                                   In this case I believe it was not an
             exact amount, but it was like 242,000.
         16
         17
                      THE COURT: Did I sign it already?
         18
                      MR. MARTIN:
                                   Yes.
                                          It's already been signed.
                      THE COURT: Well, let me find it. Hold on.
         19
         20
                  (Judge conferring with case manager.)
10:54:02
                      THE COURT: I don't know if it's part of the sentence
         21
                      I don't know how that works. But -- oh, it doesn't
         22
             or not.
         23
             say. Do you know? Can you see what it is, Byron? Can you
         24
             look at it?
                  (Judge conferring with case manager.)
10:54:23
```

THE COURT: And the Court will make the previous 1 10:54:33 judgment entered in this case, money judgment, for \$242,907.90 2 3 a part of the judgment in this case. Mr. Ardoin, do you know of any reason why the 4 5 sentence should not be imposed as stated? 10:54:47 6 MR. ARDOIN: No, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Then the sentence is imposed as stated. 8 Mr. Grob, you can appeal your conviction if you believe that your quilty plea was somehow unlawful or 9 involuntary or if you think that there was some other 10 10:54:57 fundamental defect in the proceedings that was not waived by 11 you. However, a defendant can waive his right to appeal as 12 part of a plea agreement and you entered a waiver of your right 13 Those waivers are generally enforceable. 14 to appeal. 10:55:13 15 think yours is unenforceable for some reason, you can present that theory to the Court of Appeals. With few exceptions, any 16 17 notice of appeal must be filed within 15 days of the date that judgment is entered in this case. 18 19 Do you understand me, sir? 20 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 10:55:25 21 THE COURT: If you're without funds to pay the costs of an appeal, you can apply to the Court for in forma pauperis 22 23 status and counsel will be appointed for you. 24 understand? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 10:55:34

10:55:35	1	THE COURT: Anything else?	
	2	MR. MARTIN: Only the motion and proposed order for	
	3	dismissal of the remaining counts.	
	4	THE COURT: Okay. Anything else for the defense?	
10:55:56	5	MR. ARDOIN: If the Court would entertain making a	
	6	recommendation to the B.O.P. for either Bastrop or Beaumont.	
	7	THE COURT: Okay.	
	8	MR. ARDOIN: And also if you would	
	9	THE COURT: You don't want to just stay downtown? He	
10:56:07	10	can stay downtown, if he wants to.	
	11	MR. ARDOIN: I don't think so, Your Honor.	
	12	THE COURT: It's the further recommendation that the	
	13	defendant be incarcerated at Bastrop or Beaumont during his	
	14	term of imprisonment.	
10:56:14	15	Anything else?	
	16	MR. ARDOIN: Also, I assume, he's going to be allowed	
	17	to self report on designation?	
	18	THE COURT: Mr. Martin, any objections?	
	19	MR. MARTIN: No objection.	
10:56:21	20	THE COURT: All right. Same conditions of release,	
	21	sir. Have you had any new law violations since you've been on	
	22	bond?	
	23	THE DEFENDANT: No, ma'am. No, Your Honor.	
	24	THE COURT: Why did you look at your lawyer? You	
10:56:32	25	weren't sure?	
İ			

```
THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.
          1
10:56:33
                        THE COURT: What was that?
          2
          3
                        THE DEFENDANT: I didn't hear your question.
                        THE COURT: Okay. Have you committed any more
          4
          5
              crimes --
10:56:46
          6
                        THE DEFENDANT: I like to run everything by my
          7
              attorney.
          8
                        THE COURT: Okay. Have you committed any more crimes
          9
              since you've been on bond?
                        THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.
         10
10:56:48
         11
                        THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Y'all are excused.
                       MR. ARDOIN: Thank you, Your Honor.
         12
                   (Concluded at 10:56 a.m.)
         13
         14
         15
              I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the
              record of proceedings in the above-entitled cause, to the best
         16
              of my ability.
         17
         18
                                                          <u>2-26-2020</u>
Date
              /s/<u>Xathy L. Metrger</u>
Kathy L. Metzger
         19
              Official Court Reporter
         20
         21
         22
         23
         24
         25
```